Remarks

Claims 1 – 45 are pending. Claims 1 – 45 are presently rejected. Claims 1, 14, 21, and 40 have been amended. Examination and reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks are respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejection

Claims 1 – 32, 40, and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Application Publication No. 2003/0119581 ("Cannon").

Independent claims 1, 14, 21 and 40 have been amended.

Claims 1, 14, 21 and 40, as now amended, are directed to a gaming system that includes a plurality of gaming machines. Each of the gaming machines includes first and second displays, and is linked to a remote display. After triggering a feature game, a first image content is displayed on the second display, and different second image content is displayed on the remote display. The first image content cooperates with at least certain of the different second image content on the remote display to communicate an outcome of a feature game.

Cannon does not anticipate claims 1, 14, 21, and 40.

Rather, Cannon discloses displaying an image on display 162 and essentially the same image on monitor 236. The contents of the images as displayed in display 162 and monitor 236 are the same, regardless of the size of the images displayed. For example, Cannon explicitly discloses that "[d]isplaying the bonus game on bonus display device 236 may allow non-participating casino patrons to view the game and become involved in the excitement." That is, the content or the game field 430 as displayed on display 162 is also shown on both display 162 and monitor 236. That is, Cannon does not disclose "causing feature images having first image content occurring on at least one of the displays of at least one of the gaming machines during the playing of the feature game on the at least one gaming machine to cooperate with at least certain different feature images having second image content occurring on the remote display

and using the feature images in determining a feature outcome on the at least one gaming machine participating in the feature game," among other things. Cannon simply enlarges the second display's content and displays the same content on the remote display.

The Examiner also agrees that "displays 162 and 236 [of Cannon] appear to display the same content at the same point in time." See page 12 of Action.

Therefore, Cannon does not anticipate independent claims 1, 14, 21, and 40.

Therefore, claims 1, 14, 21, and 40 are allowable.

Claims 2 – 13, claims 15 – 20, claims 22 – 39, and claim 41 depend from claims 1, 14, 21, and 40, respectively. Therefore, claims 2 – 13, 15 – 20, 22 – 39, and 41 are also allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1, 14, 21, and 40.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection

Claims 33 – 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cannon.

It cannot be said that Cannon renders claims 21, from which claims 33 – 39 ultimately depend, obvious. As discussed above, Cannon discloses enlarging images as displayed in the second display and displayed representations of enlarged images in the remote display. Such enlargement does not need any cooperation between different images on respective displays because the enlargement simply duplicates and enlarges the images as displayed.

Therefore, claim 21 is patentable over Cannon, and allowable.

Therefore, claims 33 – 39 are also allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 21.

CONCLUSION

Entry of the Amendment and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. The undersigned is available for telephone consultation at any time.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 13, 2011

By: /Larry M. Jarvis/
Larry M. Jarvis
Reg. No. 27,341
Attorney for Applicants

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60661
Phone: (312) 775-8000
Fax: (312) 775-8100